

Executive Registry

76-0032

5 January 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Administration
Deputy Director for Intelligence
Deputy Director for Operations
Deputy Director for Science and Technology
Chairman, Senior Executive Career Service Panel

SUBJECT: FY 76 Annual Personnel Plan

1. The review of the FY 76 Annual Personnel Plan is now completed and copies of the Consolidated Report and Career Service Comparative Charts are forwarded for your information and individual analysis. The overview of personnel planning in the Agency provided in this report is of significant interest in a number of areas, and I recommend that you have appropriate Subgroup analyses and comparative charts prepared in order to evaluate the achievements and continued adherence to the objectives of your Career Service. I have asked that Subgroup analyses be prepared of certain of these charts for my own interest, and will communicate with you separately on any points that come out of these.

2. While we can always hope to do better, the achievements for FY 75 and the goals for FY 76 are generally satisfactory. The Agency projection for On-Duty-Strength for 30 September 1976 appears to pose no problems though some of the Career Services project an ODS in excess of their CSGA. This is a matter which will require attention. The lateral entry for GS-12 and above personnel did not meet the Agency goals though several Career Services exceeded their individual goals. I would like to see all the Services take advantage of the opportunity that lateral entry at these higher grade levels offers for obtaining new insights, different experiences and varied viewpoints, all of which can benefit the Career Service and the Agency. The Personnel Development Program related data listed in the APP cannot be judged without the final FY 76 PDP submissions,

which I understand are considerably delayed. The figures given, however, appear to be minimum in relation to the areas concerned, and I ask that you insure that proper attention is given to the development of your middle level officers (GS-13 - GS-15) identified in PDP, to include appropriate assignments with increasing responsibilities, as well as consideration for developmental tours, and for mid- and upper-level executive and management training courses.

3. Among other items in the APP report which give me concern are the following and I ask that every effort be made to improve both the goals and the achievements.

a. Conversions to Professional Status

The figure for internal conversions to professional status remains high in comparison to the total professional input programed. I believe this is an area of great importance in the personnel management process, and strongly recommend, for the benefit of the Agency and of the individual employee, that personnel in these categories be carefully screened to insure they possess the necessary capabilities and talents for the development required for a professional performance to at least the middle grade level. Otherwise, conversion of good and loyal colleagues, ostensibly a considerate and helpful gesture, can lay the seeds for later inefficiency and frustration harming both the employee and the Agency.

b. Rotational Assignments

Rotational assignments of professional personnel need more attention from senior management. The Agency average for intra Career Service rotational moves is 5.7%, and the number is considerably bolstered by heavy DDO movement. Apart from the DDO, I believe numbers can be increased. As I recall, comments have been made that the intra Service rotational movement is more productive and meaningful than inter Career Service assignments; if so, it would seem appropriate that this number be larger. The achievements and goals for inter Career Service movement are also low. The Agency goal for FY 75 given in the FY 75 APP was only 2% of the total professional ODS. The achievement for FY 75 was 1.7% and the same percentage has been established for FY 76. The benefits of rotational tours for the individual and for a Career Service are considerable, and I ask again that every effort be made to increase the number of such assignments, both intra and inter Service.

c. Personal Rank Assignments

The FY 75 APP reported some small success in reducing the number of then existing long-term PRAs. This year you will have noted the report format was expanded, and we find the new data required has provided statistics of some concern. The PRA is a management tool designed to support the competitive promotion system and to provide an administrative mechanism allowing for temporary assignments in lower grades without penalty to the individual and for needed flexibility in certain overseas assignment situations. Because of the averaging factor, the information on the consolidated Agency PRA report becomes homogenized with approximately two staff years for each PRA. Analysis of the individual reports, however, provides data to which I feel we must address ourselves. The abuse of the system is in extending the PRAs beyond the original date and often the original purpose, and in the two grade PRA situations. Attached to your individual copies of this memorandum are lists of some of the PRA situations cited in your APP reports which I feel should be personally reviewed to determine their need and to establish a date when proper assignments can be arranged.

d. Equal Opportunity Statistics

While the On Duty Strength for Women and Black professional personnel increased in FY 75 over FY 74, the FY 75 goals were not achieved, though some Services were only a few numbers short. The identification of the Asian American and Hispanic groups continues under review, but the indications are that the FY 74 On Duty Strength for the two groups is exceeded in FY 75 by eleven. I am aware of the time and effort put into EEO activities and believe that Agency management is doing and will continue to do the best job possible in recruitment and appointment. The goals for FY 76 appear reasonable with the exception of the Hispanic increase which may be unrealistically high in the DDS&T. The massing of the EEO professional populations in the grades below GS-13 should gradually spread out as the promotion goals are achieved. Goals for all promotions, except for Asian American Technical personnel, a very small group, exceed the current On Duty Strength for the respective groups. The grade distribution also probably accounts for the small number enrolled in the management and executive training courses. Equity for these groups of employees, and a defensible Agency position, will not be achieved, however, without unremitting attention by managers.

e. Separations

Analysis of the Separation Chart suggests that we are not adequately pressing for the early departure of individuals ranking at the bottom percentage of their grades in the Career Services. Headquarters Regulation [] provides that the selection out procedure can apply to "those employees whose qualifications and potential are low in comparison to those of other employees of the same grade and occupational category." As you know, we have established a procedure to identify such individuals and to advise them of their rankings. We have also established the procedure that no adverse action be taken on the first such ranking so that the individual has fair warning and an opportunity to improve his performance. This finding need not reflect unsatisfactory performance, merely that the ranking is low among those who are satisfactory or even strong as found by the appropriate panels following proper procedures. I believe it important to proceed with this program in the interests of the individuals who otherwise may be left in a deadend position with respect to promotion over many years, rather than being encouraged, at an early time rather than too late, to seek alternate careers where they will find more satisfaction. I also believe it important to the health of the Agency to open spaces for additional entering personnel, both young and lateral. We must avoid the danger that, having eliminated the World War II age "hump," we could produce another one. I have asked that the chart on page 22 be supplemented to reflect the separation of such individuals, either voluntarily after counseling or involuntarily pursuant to the regulation, so that attention may be maintained on this important program.

STATINTL

f. Fitness Reports

There is a continuing "rating creep" in the Fitness Report evaluations which must be controlled. Over 70% of the ratings given in all the Career Services except the DDI and the E Service are "Strong." "Strong" is not an average performance, and to use this rating so freely penalizes the individual whose performance truly merits the evaluation. I suggest the Services review the Fitness Report guidelines and issue instructions which will reverse this trend, emphasizing that "Proficient" by the definition on the report form is a completely satisfactory

rating. It is not derogatory and is much more likely to reflect the average performance level in the Agency. The experience of the DDI in providing guidances to its managers and supervisors is worth noting, resulting in a more realistic relation between "Proficient" and "Strong" ratings in the Fitness Reports for that Service.

STATINTL



W. E. Colby
Director

Attachment: a/s

P. S.

I would like to discuss this at the Management Committee meeting to be held after the Morning Meeting on 13 January. I would hope you might familiarize yourself with the charts prior to that time, since they reflect your Directorate. The Office of Personnel will provide you separately with Directorate breakouts of some of the overall totals reflected in the report.